

Informal: For discussion only
RE: Application 10/584,135
Page 1 of 2

TO: Examiner Zewdu BEYEN, 571-270-7157 (voice), 571-270-8157 (fax)
FROM: Hyung Sohn, 703-816-4891 (voice), 703-816-4100 (fax)
RE: Application 10/584,135
Date: December 3, 2009

Examiner Beyen,

Thank you for taking my call and agreeing to talk with me. To make the process a bit more efficient, the following is what we hope to discuss.

In short, we would like to understand your interpretation of the claims and how they read on the applied references. To the extent that there are any areas you would like more clarification, I will do my best to explain. Sometime there are genuine differences of opinion between the Examiner and our client on whether or not the claimed invention is patentable. But often times, our experience is that the Examiner does agree there are distinctions, but the disagreement is due to differences between what the claims are intended to express and how the claims are actually interpreted by the Examiner. Our hope is that the current situation is the latter. Assuming that our situation is the latter hoped-for situation (it's merely a claim expression issue), then it is our desire to arrive at some understanding regarding the type of clarifying amendments that would be acceptable to both you and our client.

For example, independent claim 1 recites monitoring link status information, updating routing element, determining at least two routes with similar link quality and routing data packet via the at least two routes (which are of similar link quality). You

Informal: For discussion only
RE: Application 10/584,135
Page 2 of 2

refer to the abstract of Billhartz to disclose these. If you can explain how you are interpreting the claim to read on Billhartz, that would be appreciated.

Also, we do have one specific question. In the After-Final Amendment, we simply incorporated dependent claim features into the independent claims, and yet, the Advisory Action indicated this raised new issues. If you can explain, then we can notify our client as well.

As mentioned previously, we would like to understand your interpretation of the claims and how they read on the applied references. Your interpretation of the phrases and terminologies used in the claims may differ from what was intended. If so, we hope to bridge the gap so that the prosecution may move forward.

Of course, we would welcome any insights or suggestions that may not have been thought of including what other features that you consider may be worthwhile to pursue.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. I will call you at the appointed time (10am, December 4, 2009).

- Hyung Sohn

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hyung Sohn', written in a cursive style.